<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee:</th>
<th>Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>25 November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>INFORMATION REPORT- Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relating to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Eastcote Lane, South Harrow – request to address speeding, congestion and pedestrian safety and condition of carriageway and footways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parkside Way – condition of the road surface, speed and volume of traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grove Hill Road – request for a permanent road closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stanley Road, South Harrow – condition of road surface together with volume and speed of traffic and parking problems following development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eastcote Road – objections to proposed waiting restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Honeypot Lane – Request for parking controls outside shops south of Wemborough Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Officer:</td>
<td>Brendon Hills - Corporate Director, Community and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Holder:</td>
<td>Councillor Susan Hall – Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Exempt:** No

**Enclosures:**
- Appendix A - Eastcote Lane - full petition text
- Appendix B - Parkside Way - full text of petition letter
- Appendix C - Parkside Way - response to petitioners
- Appendix D - Grove Hill Road - full petition text
- Appendix E - Response to Grove Hill Road petition
- Appendix F - Stanley Road, response sent to ward councillor regarding petition
- Appendix G - Eastcote Road - plan of parking proposals

### SECTION 1 - Summary

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received and listed above.

**FOR INFORMATION**

### SECTION 2 - Report

2. **Petitions**

2.1. **Eastcote Lane, South Harrow**

2.2. A petition was presented to this Panel meeting on 15 September 2009 by a local ward councillor. The petition contained 55 signatures from 44 addresses
2.3. The petition states:-

“We the undersigned call on Harrow Council and Gareth Thomas MP to urgently undertake an investigation to establish a solution to the excessive speeding, congestion and pedestrian safety along Eastcote Lane, South Harrow…”

2.4. The petition goes on to detail the residents’ concerns and makes some suggestions for measures to address them. It then goes on to call for resurfacing of a section of the carriageway which it states is “full of ruts..” causing cars to swerve and a pedestrian tripping hazard. It finally calls for repair of certain sections of damaged pavements. The full text of the petition is at Appendix A.

2.5. All the petition signatures come from people living on the western end of Eastcote Lane between its junctions with Kings Road and the borough boundary close to the roundabout junction with Field End Road.

2.6. The Chairman of this Panel and officers met the ward councillor, who as a local resident had organised the petition, in Eastcote Lane to discuss the issues raised and examine the traffic conditions.

2.7. An analysis of the data for personal injury collisions for the 3 years to May 2009 revealed 25 collisions involving personal injury had occurred in the full length of Eastcote Lane. 15 of these collisions occurred on the western section. Although the number of collisions is slightly higher than on comparable sections or road there were no significant clusters or common causes/conditions for the collisions nor is there a particular time when they are occurring. This makes it difficult to develop specific measures to address them.

2.8. The section of Eastcote Lane from the signalised junction with Alexandra Avenue to the borough boundary is essentially straight. Roxeth Manor School and Rooks Heath High School are on the north side of the road to the east of the junction with Malvern Avenue. There is a shopping parade near the Malvern Avenue junction.

2.9. Possible measures were discussed with the ward councillor and it was agreed that traffic surveys and further analysis would be undertaken by officers to see what safety measures might be most appropriate for this road.

2.10. The level of injuries caused by traffic collisions does not meet the criteria for the London Safety Camera Partnership (LSCP) to install a fixed speed enforcement camera as requested in the petition. LSCP, a partnership including Transport for London (TfL), the Police and the courts, requires incidents leading to at least four fatal or serious injuries, of which two need to be speed related for the introduction of a fixed camera under current guidelines.
2.11. The scope for measures to address accidents is limited as Eastcote Lane is a distributor road. Relatively small scale measures might include vehicular activated signs (VAS) which warn drivers who are exceeding the speed limit to slow down. High visibility beacons to better alert drivers approaching the zebra crossing could also be considered. A more ambitious proposal for a (mini) roundabout at the Eastcote Lane / Kings Road junction, if physically feasible, would need specific funding to be identified.

2.12. A copy of the petition has been passed to Harrow Engineering with regard to the surfacing issues and they are investigating these separately and they will respond directly to the lead petitioner.

2.13. Parkside Way - Speed, Lorries and Poor road surface.

2.16 A series of photocopied letters in which 38 residents had completed their details and provided their signature were received by the council in late September and early October 2009. These are being treated as a petition. One of these pro-forma type letters was accompanied by a separate letter giving further details of the concerns.

2.17 The main concerns raised in the pro-forma letter are:

(i) Traffic speeds and concern for road safety
(ii) Number of large lorries using the road, Parkside Way
(iii) That the road was poorly maintained leading to vibrations mainly caused by lorries.

2.18 The full text of the pro-forma type letter is at Appendix B

2.19 The issues raised by this petition are almost identical to a petition reported to this Panel on 30 November 2005. Subsequent to that petition and representations a new zebra crossing has been introduced just to the west of the park entrance as part of the Safer Routes to School programme / School Travel Plan for Pinner Park School. A VAS which illuminates to warn drivers exceeding the speed limit to slow down has also been introduced for eastbound traffic. There are plans for relocation of this sign to a more prominent position and for an additional VAS for westbound traffic.

2.20 The number of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) is a longstanding complaint of residents. It has been explained to residents that although Parkside Way lies within one of the borough’s lorry ban areas, HGVs are entitled to use the roads for access to addresses within that zone. Only through HGV traffic is banned and the enforcement of that ban, a Police responsibility, is problematic. A further classified traffic survey has been ordered which will provide data on traffic speeds and a breakdown of the traffic flow into various categories of vehicles which will allow us to quantify the volume of HGV traffic.
2.21 The Police carry out periodic speed enforcement in Parkside Way using a mobile unit following the council’s previous request for enforcement. The Police will be advised of the traffic survey data which could be used to update their enforcement programme.

2.22 The longstanding complaint regarding the surface condition of Parkside Way focuses largely on the reinstatements carried out on behalf of the utility company EDF on the southern side of the road. The contractor has carried out repairs to certain sections of the reinstatements found to be defective at the time however this has failed to satisfy residents. Further detailed investigation of the quality of the reinstatement work in the form of sample cores are being undertaken to assess compliance with relevant specification. Recent technical advancements have also enabled a more robust method of inspection whereby compaction of the backfill materials can now also be tested to ensure compliance after the works have been completed. If it is found that the current reinstatement does not meet with compaction requirements or layer depths, the council may have a case for legal proceedings against EDF Energy to rectify the reinstatement.

2.23 All road and pavements in the borough are inspected by experienced highway inspectors on a periodic basis and also when reports are received about poor condition. Following their inspection necessary repairs to make any roads safe are undertaken. In appropriate cases they would also refer the roads to highway engineers for consideration for the road(s) to be included in the planned maintenance programme.

2.24 In addition to the responsive regime, the Council has a planned maintenance works programme. This programme of works is determined via a robust scheme priority scoring system. The system ensures the resources are targeted at those sections of roads in need of repair within the context of Council's overall funding and priorities.

2.25 Parkside Way, being a classified non principal road, means a structural survey is carried out annually by an independent consultant in accordance with the nationally approved computerised pavement management system for such roads. Those roads and pavements highlighted by the survey for further investigation are inspected by the highway engineers to assess the overall structural condition.

2.26 The schemes are then prioritised by taking into the account structural surveys carried out by independent consultant, highway engineers assessments, type of road, street classification, usage, funding source, risk factors, corporate objectives and other factors.

2.27 The council has written to all the petitioners advising them of its actions to investigate and address the issues raised by the petition. The text of that letter is at Appendix C.
2.28 **Grove Hill Road - request to close northern end of road**

2.29 A petition comprising 16 signatures from 15 residential and business addresses in Grove Hill Road, Harrow was submitted to the council’s Democratic Services.

2.30 The petition states:-

“Please find attached a petition for the permanent closure of one end of Grove Hill Road (HA1). The residents and businesses located on Grove Hill Road, supported by local councilors and following consultation with Harrow Police would like to close one end of Grove Hill Road to traffic. We would like pedestrian access to remain.”

2.31 The petition goes on to state five main reasons for the closure; states Peterborough Hill as the preferred end for the closure and suggests the form the closure might take.

2.32 The full text of the petition is at Appendix D.

2.33 The five reasons given for the closure are “1. Increase in traffic; 2. Bus usage and parking; 3. Construction vehicle usage and parking; Local environment and new police station; and 5. Previous agreement to close road.

2.34 Consideration of the feasibility of the requested closure focussed on the traffic and safety impact of such a closure on the road network. Grove Hill Road is currently a one way street running between Tyburn Lane and Peterborough Road. Closing Grove Hill Road would have a significant detrimental effect on traffic on surrounding roads. Particular concern was the impact on Tyburn Lane and the signalised junction with Peterborough Road and Kenton Road. Tyburn Lane and its continuation Kenton Road (to the east) and Lowlands Road (to the west) are part of London’s strategic road network (SRN). The provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 require the council to formally notify Transport for London (TfL) of any schemes which are likely to have an impact on the SRN. Ultimately TfL have the final decision on anything that affects the SRN.

2.35 Despite there being clearly identified benefits for the residents and businesses in their petition the conclusion of the investigation into the practicality of the closure showed overwhelming detrimental impact on traffic conditions on other roads nearby. The text of the response sent to the lead petitioner is at Appendix E.

2.36 **Stanley Road, South Harrow**

2.37 A petition comprising 45 signatures from 34 addresses (30 addresses from Stanley Road, South Harrow) was submitted to the council’s Democratic Services. Gareth Thomas MP sent a letter in support of the petition.
2.38 The petition states:-

(i) “We the undersigned request that Harrow Council and Gareth Thomas MP urgently address the terrible condition of the pavements in Stanley Road, South Harrow following their destruction caused by the daily use of heavy Lorries using the road during the construction of Barrats-The Arc”

(ii) “Furthermore when the construction was completed at the beginning of March 2009, and the new residents having moved into the large development, car traffic has increased alarmingly and is regularly travelling at excessive speeds along Stanley road and also neighbouring roads.”

(iii) “Therefore, we the undersigned also call on Harrow Council and Gareth Thomas MP to urgently undertake an investigation to establish a solution to the increased traffic, excessive speeding and parking on this and neighbouring roads.”

2.39 The condition of the footways (pavements) in Stanley Road was last inspected on 1 July 2009 and no repairs were considered to be necessary at that time.

2.40 The occupancy of the new development will have resulted in some increase in traffic using Stanley Road however the road is a cul-de-sac and, as a result, experienced very low traffic movement prior to the development. This may now give rise to the impression that traffic levels have increased more substantially than they actually have. This 'low pre-development' use was considered and 'factored in' at the planning application stage and it was concluded that any additional traffic generation would not significantly affect the capacity or safety of the highway network.

2.41 A traffic survey has been ordered which will help quantify the speeding problem raised by the petition in addition to providing information on traffic flows. Stanley Road beyond its junction with Sherwood Road is a cul de sac so has no through traffic. Despite the additional traffic generated from occupancy of the development it is expected traffic flows will be comparable if not below many similar roads with through traffic.

2.42 The speed data from the traffic survey will, if appropriate, be provided to the Police who have responsibility for enforcement of the speed restriction in Stanley Road. The council will monitor data on traffic collisions resulting in personal injury which is collected by the Police and compiled by TfL. If speed is a significant causal factor there might be reason to consider traffic calming.

2.43 The complaint about parking will be investigated as part of the South Harrow controlled parking review which recently commenced. However it should be noted that the recently constructed adjacent development, The
Arc, is a permit restricted development and consequently residents cannot purchase a residents permit.

2.44 The ward councillor who organised the petition has been advised of the proposed investigations and will be advised of their outcome. The response sent to the ward councillor is at Appendix F. A response in similar terms was sent to Gareth Thomas MP.

2.45 Eastcote Road

2.46 A petition has been received from people associated with the Pinner Bridge Club following the statutory consultation on parking restrictions. The proposed parking restrictions are associated with the provision of cycle facilities as part of the London Cycle Network (LCN+).

2.47 The parking controls were designed after consideration of road safety and the input of external advisors. The yellow lines in question are on the approaches to a mini roundabout at the junction of Eastcote Road and Marsh Road which are on a bus route. Coupled with this are a series of bends which, with the relative narrowness of the road, means parking on either side of the road cannot be accommodated safely. The scheme was approved by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety Ref PHD 069/08

2.48 The petition, which contains 157 signatures states:-

“*We, the undersigned, strongly object to the proposed waiting and parking restrictions planned for Eastcote Road DP2009-08. This proposal will severely impact our ability to get to and play at Pinner Bridge Club*”

2.49 A plan of the proposals is contained in Appendix G

2.50 The petition has been acknowledged and the lead petitioner informed that the petition would be reported to this Panel.

2.51 It is intended to deal with the petition objections by way of a report to the Divisional Director in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety which will recommend that on balance the parking controls are implemented.

2.52 Honeypot Lane Stanmore- Request for Parking Controls

2.53 A request has been received from 8 traders in the parade of shops in the service road on the western side of Honeypot Lane just south of the junction with Wemborough Road. The traders are requesting parking controls to deal with the commuter parking that takes place which traders consider is affecting their business.

2.54 The trader who has organised the petition contacted the council a few months ago requesting that the council install parking controls
immediately. It was explained that a consultation, involving considerable
time and costs, was in fact carried out in 2007, the outcome of which was
that there was no majority support from traders. Consequently the parking
proposals were dropped.

2.55 It has been explained that the next programmed opportunity to consider
parking is the review of parking around Canons Park Station which is in
the programme approved by the Panel in February 2009. This shows a
start in Winter 2010 but will be subject to review in February 2010.

2.56 The traders have sent in their ideas for dealing with the parking problems
which include:-

- Loading Bays
- 30 minute Free Parking then Pay & Display
- 1 Hour parking restriction 11am to 12 noon Mon-Fri
- Some Residents Parking bays
- 1 Hour parking restriction 2-3pm
- 1 or 2 hour parking restrictions around mid-day
- Parking areas for business permit holders

2.57 The above comments demonstrate that there are differing views of how to
tackle the parking problems and there needs to be a consensus amongst
traders if any scheme is to be implemented.

2.58 Officers will respond to the petitioners to explain that the programme will
be reviewed by the Panel in February 2010 and that there is a need for
traders to try to agree some specific viable proposals.

SECTION 3 - Financial Implications

There are no financial implications

Name: Narinderpal Heer
On behalf of the Chief Finance Officer
Date: 11th November 2009

SECTION 4 - Further Information

None
SECTION 5 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Stephen Freeman, Interim Traffic and Road Safety Team Leader, Tel: 0208 424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7622, email: stephen.freeman@harrow.gov.uk

Paul Newman, Interim Parking and Sustainable Transport Team Leader, Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622, email: paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Petitions and Reply to lead petitioners